UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,181	10/30/2000	James M. Zombek	003636.0086	3564

7590 05/27/2005

MANELLI DENSION & SELTER
ATTN: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN, EQS.
2000 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20016

EXAMINER	
NAJJAR, SALEH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/698,181	ZOMBEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saleh Najjar	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,10,13,15-19 and 27-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,10,13,15-19 and 27-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 10, 2005. Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, 27, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, and 50 were amended. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 13, 15-19, and 27-52 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 13, 15-19, and 27-52 represent method system and program for Re-Directing Requests from Browsers for communication over Non-IP based networks.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 13, 15-19, and 27-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims were amended to include the feature of communicating using "simple network transport protocol". There is no such description of a SNTP protocol in the specification.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 13, 15-19, and 27-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims were amended to include the feature of a SNTP. There is no such protocol in the network technological field.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 10, 29-32, and 35-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305.

Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile-based client server system (see abstract).

As to claim 8, Gupta teaches a method of deploying content to client applications, comprising:

accepting inbound messages from a mobile client application running on a mobile client device via a proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-2; col. 4, lines 5-15, see proxy 34);

accessing a HTTP redirector acting as a mobile client side proxy (see fig. 2; col. 4, lines10-40, proxy layer 34)

packaging said inbound messages into an internal message format with said HTTP redirector (see col. 4, lines 25-55, Gupta discloses that a messages are packed for transmission by proxy 34);

forwarding the packaged message to a back-end server via a message router over a non-IP network protocol network (see figs. 2-3; col. 4, lines 40-45, Gupta discloses that the proxy forwards the packaged message through the client message handler 36 and server message handler 40 which act as gateways, a router is a layer 3 gateway, Gupta further incorporates U.S. Patent No. 5,850,517 col. 7, lines 1-40 which teaches non-IP wireless network);

receiving a response from a web server over said non-IP protocol network(see col. 5, lines 30-50, Gupta discloses that a response is received from web server 44 over network 30);

packaging said response into said internal message format by said back-end server and forwarding the response to the HTTP redirector via a message router and a

protocol gateway (see figs. 2-3; col. 5, lines 42-55, Gupta discloses that WEB agent 42 packs the response back to the internal message format which is forwarded by the message handler 40 to the client message handler system 36, the message handlers act as a gateway).

As the examiner best understand the claim language. It is assumed that the applicant meant to include communicating using a SNMP.

Gupta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of communicating using SNMP.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using SNMP is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by specifying communication using SNMP. One would be motivated to do so since SNMP is not limited to TCP/IP, and can be used to manage and monitor all sorts of equipment including computers, routers, wiring hubs, toasters and jukeboxes.

As to claim 10, Gupta teaches the method of claim 8 above further comprising:

Unpacking said packaged response by the HTTP redirector; and transferring said unpacked response to said mobile client application running on said mobile client device via the proxy IP/port (see col. 4, lines 30-45, Gupta discloses that the proxy 34 recovers the raw HTTP message responses sent to the client).

As to claim 29, Gupta teaches a messaging system comprising:

a mobile client device comprising a web browser and a redirector communicating with said web browser , said redirector packaging messages from the web browser in a fundamental network non-IP network protocol (see figs. 1-2; col. 4, lines 5-30, Gupta discloses that a messages are packed for transmission by proxy 34);

a web server; a plurality of wireless networks adapted to communicate messages between said mobile client device and said Web server and support one or more non-IP wireless network protocols (see fig. 1; col. 4, line 30, Gupta discloses that the proxy forwards the packaged message through the client message handler 36 and server message handler 40 which act as gateways, a router is a layer 3 gateway, Gupta further

incorporates U.S. Patent No. 5,850,517 col. 7, lines 1-40 which teaches non-IP wireless networks);

a protocol gateway encapsulating said fundamental non-IP network protocol, said non-IP network protocol underlining each of said one or more wireless network protocols (see col. 4, lines 25-40, Gupta discloses that the client message handler acts as a gateway);

a communicator to communicate messages between said web browser and said Web server over said non-IP wireless network protocol through said protocol gateway independent of a selected wireless network protocol (see col. 4, lines 36-40, Gupta discloses that the client and server communicate through message handlers that act as gateways).

Gupta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of communicating using SNMP.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using SNMP is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by specifying communication using SNMP. One would be motivated to do so since SNMP is not limited to TCP/IP, and can be used to manage and monitor all sorts of equipment including computers, routers, wiring hubs, toasters and jukeboxes.

As to claim 30, Gupta teaches the system of claim 30 above wherein said server is an HTTP proxy server, which is adapted to receive a plurality of HTTP requests from said client device, send each the request over the Internet to the server and transmit a response corresponding thereto from the server to the client device (see col. 4).

As to claim 31, Gupta teaches the system of claim 29 above, wherein the proxy server is adapted to support one or more HTTP protocols (see col. 4-5).

As to claim 32, Gupta teaches the system of claim 29 above wherein said HTTP proxy server comprises a creator for creating a TCP/IP socket connection; and a manager for managing the TCP/IP socket connection (see col. 4-5).

As to claim 35, Gupta teaches a method of receiving content at a mobile client

application, comprising:

receiving HTTP content at said mobile client application over a non-IP protocol network (see col. 4, lines 40-55, Gupta discloses receiving HTTP content at a mobile client over a wireless on-IP network);

redirecting said HTTP content in said non-IP protocol to a content packager, (see figs. 1-3; col. 4, lines 1-60, Gupta discloses using message handlers and a proxy layer at the client for packaging HTTP content for presentation at the mobile client);

packing said HTTP content for presentation at said mobile client application, and presenting said HTTP content said mobile client application (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses using message handlers and a proxy layer at the mobile client for packing HTTP content for presentation at the client).

Gupta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of communicating using SNMP.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using SNMP is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by specifying communication using SNMP. One would be motivated to do so since SNMP is not limited to TCP/IP, and can be used to manage and monitor all sorts of equipment including computers, routers, wiring hubs, toasters and jukeboxes.

As to claim 36, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 35, wherein said step of redirecting further comprises;

acting as a client side proxy (see col. 4, lines 20-60).

As to claim 37, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 35, wherein said step of redirecting further comprises:

decompressing of said HTTP content (see col. 4, lines 15-20).

As to claim 38, Gupta teaches a method of deploying HTTP content to an Internet server, comprising:

deploying HTTP content to said Internet server (see col. 4, lines 40-55);

redirecting said HTTP content to a non-IP protocol in a content packager (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses that the proxy layer and message handler redirect HTTP content to a wireless non-IP protocol network);

packing said HTTP content for presentation to a non-IP network;

and presenting said HTTP content to said non-IP network (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses using message handlers and a proxy layer at the mobile client for packing HTTP content for presentation at the client).

Gupta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of communicating using SNMP.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using SNMP is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by specifying communication using SNMP. One would be motivated to do so since SNMP is not limited to TCP/IP, and can be used to manage and monitor all sorts of equipment including computers, routers, wiring hubs, toasters and jukeboxes.

As to claim 39, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 38, wherein said step of redirecting further comprises:

acting as a client side proxy (see col. 4-5).

Claims 40-52 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 8, 10, 29-32, 35-39 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 13, 15-19, 27-28, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305 in view of Aravamudhan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,563,919 (referred to hereafter as Ara).

Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile-based client server system (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Gupta teaches a method of deploying content to client applications, comprising:

Accepting inbound messages from a mobile client application running on a mobile client device via a proxy IP/port port (see figs. 1-2; col. 4, lines 5-15, see proxy 34);

packaging said inbound messages into an internal message format with an HTTP redirector (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses that a messages are redirected through the proxy 34);

forwarding said packaged message from said mobile client device to a back-end server over a non-IP protocol network; receiving a response from a web server (see col. 5, lines 30-45, Gupta discloses that a request is forwarded by the server 22 to the web server 44);

packaging the response into the internal message format with the back-end server and forwarding the response to the HTTP redirector (see col. 4, lines 25-55, Gupta discloses that a messages are packed for transmission by proxy 34); and

transferring the response to the client application running on the client device via the proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-3; col. 5-6).

Gupta fails to teach the limitation wherein the HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service and accesses it to obtain information about a wireless protocols supported by the client device.

However, Ara teaches a gateway cluster having a number of gateways for different types of communication protocols by converting network messages to normalized messages by querying the mobile systems where the messages where generated (see abstract). Ara teaches HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service (see col. 6, Ara discloses that a unified mobility manager UMM 30 provide a unified hardware for processing and providing responses for various types of mobile communications protocols by providing a unified directory services).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by providing a unified directory of services at the agent 42 to provide for multiple protocol translations. One would be motivated to do so to allow for different types of mobile platforms to interact with the system.

The combination of Gupta and Ara do not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of communicating using SNMP.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using SNMP is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Gupta and Ara by specifying communication using SNMP. One would be motivated to do so since SNMP is not limited to TCP/IP, and can be used to manage and monitor all sorts of equipment including computers, routers, wiring hubs, toasters and jukeboxes.

As to claim 2, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 above.

Gupta fails to teach the limitation wherein the library of mobile services are stored at the client. Gupta does teach that the client device may reconnect and communicate with the server via different network media (see col. 9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,517 which was incorporated into the Gupta reference in col. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by storing the library of services at the client side. One would be motivated to do so to allow the client to connect to the servers through different network media.

As to claim 4, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the HTTP redirector acts as a client side proxy (see col. 4).

As to claim 5, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides compression of the inbound packaged message (see figs. 1-3; col. 4, lines 15-20).

As to claim 6, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides decompression of the response (see col. 4)

As to claim 7, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector unpacks the packaged response (see col. 4).

Claims 13, 15-19, 27-28, and 33-34 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-2, 4-7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

7. Applicant's arguments filed March 10, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that The Gupta and Ara references fail to teach a simple network transport protocol.
In response, the Examiner cannot identify any literature that discusses a "Simple Network Transport Protocol", the applicant's representative is invited to call the Examiner to clarify this issue.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (571)272-4006.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Saleh Najjar
Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157